
d
a
b
j
e
c
f
g
p
h
k
s


a
l
p
b
k


f
c
h
e
d
f
g
c
b
a
e


A
j
k
D
u
a
w
L1
c
b
L2
p
s


b
a
a’
p


v
g
p
h


f
c
h
e
f
II
I
d
g
c
k
j
III
a
b
e


Average hop of all paths
Number of nodes
GPSR
HDAR
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
50
100
150
200
250
300


Average length of all paths
Number of nodes
200
180
160
140
120
100
80
60
50
100
150
200
250
300
GPSR
HDAR


Average number of computational times
Number of nodes
HARG
HDAR
140
120
100
80
60
40
20
50
100
150
200
250
300


d
p


d
e
f
a
b
p


d
a
c
e
p
b
s
k

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

Procedia Computer Science 00 (2014) 1–13

Procedia Computer Science

arXiv:1412.8222v1 [cs.NI] 28 Dec 2014

Hole Detection and Shape-Free Representation and Double Landmarks Based Geographic Routing in Wireless Sensor Networks

Jianjun Yang[a], Zongming Fei[b], Ju Shen[c]

[a]*Department of Computer Science and Information Systems, University of North Georgia, Oakwood, GA. Email: jianjun.yang@ung.edu*
[b]*Department of Computer Science, University of Kentucky, Lexington,KY. Email: fei@netlab.uky.edu*
[c]*Department of Computer Science, University of Dayton, Dayton, OH. Email: jshen1@udayton.edu*

Abstract

In wireless sensor networks, an important issue of Geographic Routing is "local minimum" problem, which is caused by "hole" that blocks the greedy forwarding process. Existing geographic routing algorithms use perimeter routing strategies to find a long detour path when such a situation occurs. To avoid the long detour path, recent research focuses on detecting the hole in advance, then the nodes located on the boundary of the hole advertise the hole information to the nodes near the hole. Hence the long detour path can be avoided in future routing. We propose a heuristic hole detecting algorithm which identifies the hole easily and quickly and then propose a representation of hole no matter what the shape of the hole is. In addition, we quantitatively figure out the areas in the vicinity of the hole that need to be announced the hole information. With such information, a new routing scheme with two landmarks was developed. Simulation results illustrate that our approach can achieve better performance in terms of the average length and number of hops in routing paths. Simulation also shows that our approach introduces very small computational complexity.

© 2011 Published by Elsevier Ltd.

Keywords: Hole Detection, Representation, Geographic Routing, Wireless Sensor Networks

1. Introduction

Wireless Sensor Networks(WMSNs) have emerged as one of the key technologies for wireless communications. They are undergoing rapid development and have inspired numerous applications[13][14][15][9][10] because of their advantages. A Wireless Sensor Network consists of a collection of wireless communication nodes. Two nodes within a certain distance of each other can communicate directly. However, if a source node intends to send packets to a destination outside of its transmission range, it will depend on other nodes to relay the packets. Many routing protocols (e.g., DSDV [1], AODV [2]) have been proposed to find the path from the source to the destination. The main research issue with these routing schemes is the scalability because most of them have to use flooding to find routing paths.

When the location information for nodes is available (either through GPS or using virtual coordinates [3]), routing in sensor networks can be much more efficient. Geographic routing exploits the location information and makes the routing in sensor networks scalable. The source node first acquires the location of the destination node it intends to communicate with, then forwards the packet to its neighbor closest to the destination. This process is repeated until the packet reaches the destination. A path is found via a series of independent local decisions rather than flooding. However, geographic routing suffers from the so-called local minimum phenomenon, in which a packet may get

stuck at a node that fails to find a closer neighbor to the destination, even though there is a path from the source to destination in the network. This typically happens when there is a void area (or hole) that has no active nodes. In wireless sensor network, the holes are caused by various reasons [4]. For instance, the malicious nodes can jam the communication to form Jamming Holes. If the signal of nodes is not long enough to cover everywhere in the network plane, the Coverage Holes may exist. Moreover, Routing Holes can be formed either due to voids in node deployment or because of failure of nodes due to various reasons such as malfunctioning, or battery depletion.

To deal with the local minimum problem, Karp and Kung proposed the Greedy Perimeter Stateless Routing (GPSR) protocol, which guarantees the delivery of the packet if a path exists [5]. When a packet is stuck at a node, the protocol will route the packet around the faces of the graph to get out of the local minimum. Several approaches were proposed that are originated from the face routing. Although they can find the available routing paths, they often cause the long detour paths.

Current research is focused on developing algorithms to overcome the local minimum issue in geographic routing by finding holes prior to packet forwarding towards the holes. Scholars may use particular approaches to define and find holes in some real work applications. For instance, in a sensor network that monitors temperature in a region, if we let a sensor node mark itself as unavailable once its local temperature exceeds a threshold, then the boundary of a hole can probably be determined based on the temperatures of the nodes. Such a hole is represented as a polygon that encloses all the sensors with local temperatures higher than the threshold. Unfortunately, these algorithms are time or space consuming. Moreover, the representation of a hole is too complicated. Most recent work tries to detect a hole and the nodes located on the hole's boundary in advance [6] [11]. The nodes on the boundary further advertise the hole information to some other nodes. In this way, the future routing path can be adaptive in the presence of the hole. In this chapter, we introduce an algorithm of Shape-Free Hole Representation and Double Landmarks Based Geographic Routing for wireless sensor networks. It focuses on defining and detecting holes in a wireless sensor network, representing holes and building routes around the holes. It is a heuristic algorithm aimed to detect a hole quickly and easily. The hole can be identified by a constant time complexity calculation. In addition, we provide a very concise format to represent a hole by representing a hole as a segment. Moreover, we develop an approach to make part of the nodes located on the hole's boundary announce to the nodes in the vicinity of the hole. We further found the best trade-off between the overhead of hole information announcement and the benefit for future routing.

2. Related Work

The first geographic routing protocol is based on simple greedy forwarding. In this approach, each node forwards packets to one of its neighbors who is closest to the destination node until the packets arrive the destination. This scheme is efficient. However, it fails due to the "local minimum problem".

To mitigate "local minimum problem", compass routing [12] was proposed as the first face routing, in which the packet is forwarded along the face until greedy is workable in a node. However, compass routing cannot guarantee packet delivery in all geographic networks. Several routing algorithms in face routing family have been developed. By combining greedy and face routing, Karp and Kung proposed the Greedy Perimeter Stateless Routing (GPSR) algorithm [5]. It consists of the greedy forwarding mode and the perimeter forwarding mode, which is applied in the regions where the greedy forwarding does not work. An enhanced algorithm, called Adaptive Face Routing (AFR) [16], uses an eclipse to restrict the search area during routing so that in the worst case, the total routing cost is no worse than a constant factor of the cost for the optimal route. The latest addition to the face routing family is Path Vector Face Routing(GPVFR) [17], which improves routing efficiency by exploiting local face information. The protocols in face routing family can avoid the hole. However, they often cause long detour path.

Two routing algorithms were proposed to avoid long detour path caused by hole. One is ITGR [7]. The source determines destination areas which are shaded by the holes based on previous forwarding experience. The novelty of the approach is that a single forwarding path can be used to determine an area that may cover many destination nodes. An efficient method is designed for the source to find out whether a destination node belongs to a shaded area. The source then selects an intermediate node as the tentative target and greedily forwards packets to it to avoid the long detour. Finally the intermediate target forwards the packet to the destination by greedy routing. The second is HDAR [8]. A heuristic algorithm is designed to detect a hole quickly and easily. And the hole can be identified only by calculation with constant time complexity. Then a concise representation of the hole is devised. A hole is recorded

as a segment. Moreover, an approach that let a subset of the nodes located on the holes boundary announce the hole information to the nodes in the vicinity is developed.

A new idea [6] was proposed recently, which is to detect the hole in advance, then the nodes located on the hole advertise the hole information to other nodes. The hole information will benefit nodes who receive it for their future routing. It defined a hole to be a simple region enclosed by a polygon cycle which contains all the nodes where local minimum can appear. It brought forth the "get stuck" concept and proposed the hole detection mechanism that once a packet following geographic greedy forwarding gets stuck at a node, the node must be on the boundary of a hole. Also related is HAGR [11]. HAGR investigated the nodes incident to a close loop in a geographical graph. For a vertex u, if the angle between two adjacent edges with respect to this vertex is larger than an angle threshold, then vertex u considers it is located on a potential hole. To further determine if it is located on a hole, u calculates the diameter of the loop. It locates the bisector that equally splits the angle and uses it as a reference line. Then node u finds out the leftmost node and the rightmost node furthest from the bisector. The distance between the leftmost node and the rightmost node is the diameter of the hole. If the diameter is greater than the diameter threshold and the angle is bigger than the angle threshold, u is regarded as sitting on a hole. Once a node is detected on a hole, it advertises the hole information to its neighbors. Upon receiving the hole information, its neighbor recalculates the angle and diameter based on its location. If both of them are bigger than their thresholds, then the neighbor considers it is on a hole and it continues to advertises the hole information, otherwise it stops advertisement. Base on the hole detecting, HAGR divides the network plane into three regions, and the nodes in different regions conduct different forwarding strategies. The idea of HAGR is novel. However, the hole detecting approach is time-consuming since a node has to calculate the values of two metrics. And the hole advertisement is expensive because once a node receives the hole information, it has to recalculate two values and compare them with their corresponding thresholds. In addition, the diameter threshold is an absolute value and it has to be adjusted according to the nodes' transmission range or the network deployment, otherwise false negative or false positive may occur. Moreover, the forwarding strategies are too complicated.

3. Hole Detecting Algorithm

3.1. Metric to Determine a Hole

We call our Hole Detection and Double Landmarks Based Geographic Routing algorithm HDDL. In HDDL, a node p begins to detect whether it is located on the boundary of a hole only if the angle between its two adjacent edges is greater than 120 degrees [6]. p initiates a probe message which includes its location. p sends the message to its leftmost node with respect to the angle. The leftmost node can be defined as follows. p faces the area formed by the two rays of this angle, and uses the angle's bisector line to conduct counter-clockwise sweeping. The leftmost node is the first one that is met by the sweeping line. Upon receiving the probe message, p's leftmost neighbor node writes its location into the message and passes it to its leftmost neighbor. The probe message will finally come back to node p from p's rightmost neighbor with respect to the initial investigated angle [12] [6], where the right most neighbor is defined in the similar way as the leftmost node. When the probe message circulates, it collects the locations of the nodes on its way. So node p knows all the nodes' locations on the way.

p then begins to investigate the nodes by traveling clockwise from node to node. For each node on the way, p computes the length of their probe path $length_pro()$ and their Euclidean distance $dist_euc()$. For a node x, $length_pro(p,x)/dist_euc(p,x)$ is defined as hole detection ratio from p to x. If there exists a node v, the hole detection ratio from p to whom is larger than a predefined threshold δ, that is,

$$length_pro(p,v)/dist_euc(p,v) > \delta, \qquad (1)$$

then p is considered sitting on the boundary of a hole.

3.2. Derivation of the threshold

The value of δ has essential impact to the results of hole detection. If the value of δ is too large, it introduces false negatives. If δ is too small, it causes false positives. We know that when a hole exists, there will be a detour path. So we attempt to detect a hole by finding a detour path. In our approach, "detour" path is defined as the routing path between two nodes that is much longer than their Euclidean distance. In order to quantitatively represent "much longer," we introduce a threshold δ for the ratio of routing length over Euclidean distance $length_pro()/dist_euc()$. To

determine the value of δ, we first approximate the polygon by a circle (Fig. 1) in which δ is $\pi/2 = 1.57$. But the circle cannot be a hole because no node in its circumference can be a local minimum node, so we will investigate the cases $\delta > 1.57$.



Figure 1. Illustration of the shape of a hole: scenario 1

We then increase the value of δ. Suppose that triangle abp is a equilateral triangle (Fig. 2), the length of each edge is 1, and the transmission range is slightly less than 1, such as 0.9. Then we move a to $a^{'}$ and let both $a^{'}p$ and $a^{'}b$ be equal to the transmission range. Then from p to b, a path $p \rightarrow a' \rightarrow b$ exists and it is a slight detour path. But the triangle is not a hole since none of the three nodes is a local minimum node. In this circumstance, the value of δ is approximate equal to 2.



Figure 2. Illustration of the shape of a hole: scenario 2

Then we increase the value of δ to the one that is slightly larger than 2. By analysis and experiments, we found that δ =2.25 is a good choice for a small false positive and a small false negative by experimental attempts.

3.3. False Negative and False Positive of Hole Detection

False negatives and false positives may occur during hole detection. Fig. 3 shows an example of false negative. In this figure, the transmission range is 0.9, $|\ pd\ |$=0.95, $|\ ad\ |=|\ bd\ |$=1,$|\ ed\ |=|\ df\ |$=0.9 and $|\ ap\ |=|\ pb\ |$=0.9. In this scenario, P cannot talk to d directly. Then p is a local minimum node and the polygon $paedfb$ is a hole. However, if p initiates a probe message, the distance of the probe path is 1.9. And the Euclidean distance is 0.95. The ratio

of the two distances is 2, which is less than 2.25. Consequently, HDDL does not consider that polygon *paedfb* is a hole. False negative is introduced by a very special circumstance that the detour path is between 2 to 2.25 long as the Euclidean distance, and the probe message initial node cannot talk to the destination directly. In network environment, the possibility of false negative is low. Moreover, false negative will not affect the routing too much because the detour is not too long, normally one hop longer than the Euclidean distance.



Figure 3. Illustration of a false negative when detecting holes by HDDL

False positive can also occur in some special circumstances. For instance, in Fig. 4, | *pd* |=1, | *ed* |=0.95, and | *ep* |=| *ea* |=| *ad* |=| *dc* |=| *cb* |=0.9. Once *p* wants to talk to *d*, *p* can find its neighbor *e* that is closer to *d*. Hence, *p* is not a local minimum node and then polygon *peadcb* is not a hole. However, if *p* initiates a probe message, HDDL considers that the polygon is a hole. Furthermore, node *e* and *p* will advertise the hole information to an area *epk*. The area to be announced the hole information is not big because only a few nodes (two nodes in this example) announce the hole information. Although the polygon is a fake hole detected by HDDL, the nodes in *epk* will benefit from the hole information. For example, if *s* wants to send a packet to *d*, *s* will send the packet to *d* directly instead of a detour from *p*.

False negatives and false positives appear some time. However, their impact on HDDL algorithm is limited.



Figure 4. Illustration of a false positive when detecting holes by HDDL

3.4. Detection of Holes

We derived that δ=2.25 is a good choice to detect most holes that will block greedy forwarding. Fig. 5 is an example for hole detection. Node *p* initiates the hole probe message. *p* collects the nodes' locations while the



Figure 5. Illustration of the approach of hole detection

message circulates the loop. If p finds that there exists a node v, satisfying $length_pro(p,v)/dist_euc(p,v) > 2.25$, p is considered to be sitting on a hole.

The hole that is detected is a polygon. Note that some nodes located on the polygon measure they are located on the hole, but other nodes may not consider themselves on the hole. For instance, in Fig. 5, nodes g, p and h consider themselves on the hole because there are nodes on the polygon's boundary that satisfy the hole definition for nodes g, p and h (1). However, nodes a and b at the hole polygon found by p do not consider themselves on a hole because there is no node on the hole satisfying condition (1) for nodes a and b. In fact, a or b's greedy forwarding will not be blocked by the polygon.

Any node located on the polygon may detect the hole repeatedly independently, thus a lot of overhead will be generated. We design a mechanism to reduce the redundant probes for discovering the hole. Once a node hears a probe message, it will not schedule a probe message although it has not sent out its probe message yet. In order to make each node know the location of every node on the polygon, the probe initiating node sends two probe messages at the same time, one clockwise and one counter-clockwise. (shown in Fig. 5). In this way, each node on the polygon can obtain all of the information of the polygon. Because the probe message is sent in both clockwise and counter-clockwise directions, there will be two probe paths. We choose the longer as the length of the probe path to calculate the hole detection ratio. We describe the probe message initiating algorithm in Fig. 6.

Probe_msg_initiating()

```
if does not receive a probe message
   Search whether it has an angle between two adjacent edges
   larger than 120 degrees;
   if true
      Initiate a probe message;
      Write its location to this message;
      Send it to its left node and right node of the angle.
```

Figure 6. Probe Message Initiating Algorithm

The probe message receiving algorithm is described in Fig. 7. In this algorithm, upon receiving a probe message, a node determines whether it is message initiation node. If it is, the node will calculate the hole detection ratio when both probe massages come back. If the node is not the message initiation node, it will write its location to the message and forward the message.

The probe initiator must have an angle between two adjacent edges with respect to it that is larger than 120° [6]. However, such an angle is necessary but not a sufficient condition to determine if the initiator is a local minimum node. In our algorithm, it does not matter whether the probe initiator is a local minimum node or not. The objective of the hole probe message is to find a hole, but not to determine if the probe initiator is a local minimum node.

Most likely, a probe initiator that finds a hole is a local minimum node. For example, in Fig. 5, node p initiates the probe message and finds that it is located on a hole. It is a local minimum node if it sends a packet to nodes in the

Probe_msg_receiving()

```
Compare its location with the message initiator's location to
determine whether it is the message initiator
if it is the initiator
    Search whether the two probe message from
    different directions both reached it;
    if true
        Calculate the hole detection ratio
    else
        Wait for the second probe message;
else
    Write its location;
    Forward the message to its left or right neighbor
    according to the forwarding direction.
```

Figure 7. Probe Message Receiving Algorithm

vicinity of node d. However, it is not necessary for the probe initiator to be a local minimum node. For instance, in Fig. 8, node p initiates a hole probe message and detects a hole, but p is not a local minimum node because either its neighbor g or h is closer to any destination node in the area in the opposite side of ab. The hole information will be announced to the nodes in a certain area and these nodes will benefit from the hole announcement for future routing.

In Fig. 9, p is a local minimum node. p initiates a hole probe message but it cannot detect the hole because the length of the probe path from p to any node on the polygon over their Euclidean distance is approximate to 1. However, the hole can be detected by another node such as n and the hole information will be announced to nodes in areas (ekf and $e'k'f'$) containing the nodes which will benefit from the hole information in future routing. This phenomenon indicates the scenario that a local minimum node p cannot detect a hole. This is because the polygon is long and narrow, and then the initiator's routing will not be blocked by the polygon. So this detecting result has very minor effect on p's forwarding. Nevertheless, the hole will be detected by another node who suffers from the hole.



Figure 8. Hole detection scenario: Example 1

3.5. Shape-Free Hole Representation

A hole that is detected is a polygon. The representation of a polygon is a sequence of vertices. However, in geographic routing, we do not have to care about all the nodes on the polygon because most of them have a minor



Figure 9. Hole detection scenario: Example 2

impact on determining the routing paths. What we are interested are the nodes that will block the greedy forwarding. In our model, p can calculate the two nodes whose Euclidean distance is most remote because p has already obtained all the nodes' locations on the polygon (Fig. 8). The segment connecting these two nodes looks like a board that blocks greedy forwarding. For instance, segment ab in Fig. 8 is a board that blocks greedy forwarding. Then the hole is represented as $< a, b >$. No matter what the shape of the hole is, what we are concerned is the segment connecting the two most remote nodes. The size of the hole may change due to node failure or the addition of new nodes. In order to detect and represent the hole accurately, node p needs to send the information about the vertices lying on the polygon to nodes a and b for future detection of size changes of the hole.

The greedy forwarding is stuck by the board $< a, b >$ is because some potential destination nodes are hidden behind the board, and source nodes located in a certain area on the opposite side of these hidden destinations are not aware of these destination nodes. In the basic routing approach, each node uses greedy forwarding until it fails due to a local minimum node, where greedy forwarding changes to perimeter forwarding. Thus the detour paths are generated. If the possible destination nodes hidden behind the board can be determined in advance and be announced to the source nodes unaware of these destination nodes, the lengths of the routing paths can be reduced dramatically. We determine the possible destination area (shaded area) as follows. Draw line ar perpendicular to segment ab, where r and p are on the opposite sides of ab. Also draw line bt perpendicular to line ab, where t and p are on the opposite sides of ab. Then the area $rabt$ is the shaded area (Fig. 10).

3.6. Hole Announcement

The nodes in area $rabt$ are the possible destination nodes for some source nodes. We would like to figure out an area containing these source nodes that need to be announced the hole information on the opposite side of $rabt$ (Fig. 10). The hole information can help the nodes adaptively adjust the next forwarding hops to avoid detour routing paths. In order to determine the hole announcement area, the announcement breadth and depth need to be figured out. We first determine two nodes e and f. They are the left and right nodes furthest away from each other at the same side as node p of segment ab, and satisfy the hole detection condition (1). Let c be the midpoint of segment ef. Draw segment ck perpendicular to ef. Then triangle efk is the area that should be announced the hole information. Note that if the hole announcement area is larger, more nodes will be benefited by the hole information and their future routing path will be shorter. At the same time, higher overhead will be introduced because more nodes need to be announced the hole information. So we would like to find a good balance between the benefit to future routing paths and the overhead.

The optimal values of the hole information announcement size that can both shorten the future routing path and reduce the overhead need to be found.

The announcement breadth is selected as segment ef. So the announcement depth determines the size of the area. Let $|ab|$ be L. Let $|ec|$ be l. Let $\angle cek$ be α. Then the objectives are to minimize the number of nodes in the triangle ekf and minimize the length of the path from s to d. Assume that the nodes are distributed in the plane uniformly. So the number of the nodes in $\triangle$ekf can be represented by the area of $\triangle$ekf:

$\frac{1}{2}\cdot 2l\cdot l\tan\alpha = l^2\tan\alpha, \alpha \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ (2)

For node s, if it intends to send a packet to node d, the path includes the sub-paths $s \rightarrow k$, $k \rightarrow e$, $e \rightarrow a$ and $a \rightarrow d$. The last two sub-paths are fixed, but $s \rightarrow k$ and $k \rightarrow e$ depend on α. Assume the length of sc to be h. We approximately represent the length of path sk by $h - |kc| = h - l\tan\alpha$, and the length of path $k \rightarrow e$ by $|ke|$ since the routing path generated by HDDL will be along ke. Here $|ke|$ is $\frac{l}{\cos\alpha}$. Hence from s to e, the length of paths is:

$(h - l\tan\alpha) + \frac{l}{\cos\alpha}$ (3)

We want to find an α that can try to minimize both (2)and(3). Since (2) is quadratic to l but (3) is linear to l, so what we want to achieve is:

$argMin((2) * (3)^2)$, that is:

$argMin(l^2\tan\alpha \cdot ((h - l\tan\alpha) + \frac{l}{\cos\alpha})^2)$

$= argMin(l^2h^2\tan\alpha + l^4\tan^3\alpha - 2hl^3\tan^2\alpha + \frac{l^4\tan\alpha}{\cos^2\alpha} + \frac{2hl^3\tan\alpha}{\cos\alpha} - \frac{2l^4\tan^2\alpha}{\cos\alpha})$

Let $(l^2h^2\tan\alpha + l^4\tan^3\alpha - 2hl^3\tan^2\alpha + \frac{l^4\tan\alpha}{\cos^2\alpha} + \frac{2hl^3\tan\alpha}{\cos\alpha} - \frac{2l^4\tan^2\alpha}{\cos\alpha})$ be $g(\alpha)$.

Let $h = 2l, 2.5l, 3l, 3.5l, 4l$ respectively, if there exists α_0, α_1 and α_2 satisfying:

$g(\alpha_1)' = 0$,

$g(\alpha_0)' < 0$,

and $g(\alpha_2)' > 0$

where α_0 is minor smaller than α_1,α_2 is minor larger than α_1, then the expected α can be derived. Unfortunately, when $g(\alpha_1)' = 0$, $\alpha \notin [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$. We substitute the series values of h to $g(\alpha)$, then achieve the minimal values of $g(\alpha)$ and their corresponding values of α. The average value of α is 1.05. $\tan 1.05 = 1.74$, so the depth of hole information announcement is:

$1.74 * l = 1.74 * \frac{L}{2} = 0.87L$,

Note here l is approximately represented by $\frac{L}{2}$.



Figure 10. A hole and the nodes in its vicinity area

The nodes on arc ef begin to advertise the hole information $< a, b >$ to their neighbors. In order to avoid duplicate

messages, once a node in the area has received the hole information, it simply discards the duplicate. After the advertisement of the hole's information, each node in the area efk is aware of the hole $< a, b >$. Consequently, these nodes know that any possible destination node in area *rabt* is hidden behind the hole. They should avoid packets being forwarded towards the hole in future routing (Fig. 10).

4. Adaptive routing

After the announcement, each node in the triangle ekf knows that there is a hole $< a, b >$ that blocks greedy forwarding to any destination node in area *rabt*. Thus the nodes in triangle ekf can adaptively adjust routing paths. In the network plane, once a node *s* intends to send a packet with destination *d*, it first looks up its local cache to see whether it has a hole information entry $< a, b >$. If there is no such entry in its cache, it just uses GPSR. Otherwise if there is a hole information entry $< a, b >$, but *s* and *d* are located at the same side of segment *ab*, *s* just uses GPSR. If *s* and *d* are located on the opposite sides of *ab* but *d* is not in the shaded area *rabt*, *s* just uses GPSR. Otherwise *d* lies in the area *rabt*. In this situation, *s* considers *a* or *b* as its tentative target. It writes *a* or *b* to the packet's header as a tentative target. In order to make *s* determine which one should be the tentative target, let *m* be the midpoint of segment *ab*, *mn* is perpendicular to segment *ab* and *n* is on the opposite side of *ab* relative to *s*. Then if *d* is located in area *ramn*, *s* writes *a* to the packet's head as its tentative target. If *d* is located in area *nmbt*, *s* writes *b* to the packet's head as its tentative target. When the packet reaches *a* or *b*, the tentative target will continue sending the packet to the destination node *d*. In this approach, *a* and *b* are actually two landmarks. When a node forwards a packet to its next hop, it calls procedure $HDDL_forwarding()$ given in Fig. 11.

HDDL_forwarding()

```
Look at the forwarding packet whether this node has a tentative
  target T
if true
  Compare whether this node is T;
  if true
    Remove T and forward the packet to next hop with its
      destination d;
  else
    Forward the packet to next hop with its destination T;
else
  Search local cache
  if an entry < a, b > exists
    if this node and d are at the same side of ab
      Use GPSR;
    if this node and d are at opposite sides of ab
      if d is in ramn
        Write a as tentative target T to the packet;
        Forward packet to next hop with destination T;
      if d is in nmbt
        Write b as tentative target T to the packet;
        Forward packet to next hop with destination T;
      else
        Use GPSR;
  else
    Use GPSR.
```

Figure 11. Packet Forwarding Algorithm



Figure 12. Comparisons of average length for all paths



Figure 13. Comparisons of average hop for all paths

5. Experimental Results

We perform simulations using easim3D wireless network simulator, which is used to simulate IEEE 802.11 radios and is typically used for location based routing algorithms. We use a noiseless immobile radio network environment. In the simulations, nodes with a transmission range of 20 meters are deployed in an interest area of 400m×400m.

We generate networks where the number of nodes varied from 50 to 300. For any given number of nodes, 50 networks are generated randomly. In each network, holes are generated automatically by the distribution of nodes.

Our experiments include two parts. The first part is to compare HDDL with GPSR and HAGR in terms of average length of paths and average hop of paths.

Fig. 12 shows the average length of paths when the number of nodes changes from 50 to 300. The average length in HDDL is 12.4% shorter than that of GPSR and 11.8% shorter than that of HAGR. Fig. 13 shows the average number of hops in HDDL is 13.2% less than that of GPSR and 12.7% less than that of GPSR.

In Fig. 12 and Fig. 13, the results report both the greedy path and the path in the vicinity of holes. In this way, HDDL's benefit for the paths near the holes is not highlighted. To demonstrate HDDL's impact for the paths around holes, we particular studied the paths in the vicinity of holes. we marked the paths that benefit from the hole information as "hole paths" and recorded the pairs of source and destination nodes in our HDDL. We investigated the paths generated by GPSR and HAGR with the same pairs of source and destination nodes. Then we compared the



Figure 14. Comparisons of average length for hole vicinity paths



Figure 15. Comparisons of average hop for hole vicinity paths

paths benefiting from hole information in HDDL with the paths derived from GPSR and HAGR.

The performance of HDDL, GPSR and HAGR for hole paths are reported in Fig. 14 and Fig. 15. HDDL has much shorter paths and fewer hops compared with GPSR. The two figures indicate that HDDL reduces the long detour paths around holes significantly.

The second part is to compare the computational complexity of HARG and our algorithm HDDL. We used the same networks as in part 1. We selected $5\pi/6$ as the hole detection threshold and 60 meters as the diameter threshold. In both HARG and HDDL, we investigated the number of computation times of hole detection. In HDDL, the hole information is only calculated by a few nodes located on the hole and other nodes are advertised the hole information. In HARG, a number of nodes have to perform calculation to determine the existence of a hole. The numbers of calculations performed were reported to evaluate the computational complexity. Fig. 16 illustrates that the computational complexity of HDDL is much less than that of HARG.



Figure 16. Comparisons of computational complexity

References

[1] C. Perkins, P. Bhagwat, Highly dynamic destination sequenced distance vector routing for mobile computers. ACM SIGCOMM, 1994
[2] E. Royer, C. Perkins, Ad-hoc On-Demand Distance Vector Routing. 2nd IEEE Workshop on Mobile Computing Systems and Applications, 1999.
[3] Y.-B. Ko, N. H. Vaidya, Location-aided routing (LAR) in mobile ad hoc networks. ACM/IEEE MobiCom, 1998.
[4] N. Ahmed, S. Kanhere, S. Jha, The holes problem in wireless sensor networks: a survey, SIGMOBILE Mobile Computing and Communications Review, vol. 9, April 2005.
[5] B. Karp, H. Kung, GPSR: Greedy perimeter stateless routing for wireless networks. ACM/IEEE International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking, 2000.
[6] Q. Fang, J. Gao, L. Guibas, Locating and Bypassing Holes in Sensor Networks, Mobile Networks and Applications, No. 11, 2006
[7] J. Yang, Z. Fei, ITGR: Intermediate Target Based Geographic Routing, Computer Communications and Networks (ICCCN), 2010 Proceedings of 19th International Conference on (pp. 1-6). IEEE, Zurich, Switzerland, August 2010.
[8] J. Yang, Z. Fei, HDAR: Hole Detection and Adaptive Geographic Routing for Ad Hoc Networks, Computer Communications and Networks (ICCCN), 2010 Proceedings of 19th International Conference on (pp. 1-6). IEEE, Zurich, Switzerland, August 2010.
[9] J. Yang, Z. Fei, Broadcasting with Prediction and Selective Forwarding in Vehicular Networks , International Journal of Distributed Sensor Networks, 2013 (2013).
[10] J. Yang, Z. Fei, Bipartite Graph Based Dynamic Spectrum Allocation for Wireless Mesh Networks, Distributed Computing Systems Workshops, 2008. ICDCS'08. 28th International Conference on (pp. 96-101). IEEE, Beijing, 2008.
[11] F. Xing, Y. Xu, M. Zhao, K. Khaled, HAGR: Hole Aware Greedy Routing for Geometric Ad Hoc Networks, Military Communications Conference, 2007.
[12] E. Kranakis, H. Singh, J. Urrutia, Compass routing on geometric networks. 11-th Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry, 1999
[13] J. Shen, C. Sen-Ching S., Layer depth denoising and completion for structured-light rgb-d cameras. In Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 2013 IEEE Conference on, pp. 1187-1194. IEEE, 2013.
[14] J. Shen, S. Po-Chang, C. Sen-ching Samson, J. Zhao. Virtual mirror rendering with stationary rgb-d cameras and stored 3-d background. Image Processing, IEEE Transactions, on 22, no. 9 (2013): 3433-3448.
[15] J. Shen, R. Anusha, C. Sen-ching Samson, R. Patel. Automatic content generation for video self modeling. In Multimedia and Expo (ICME), 2011 IEEE International Conference on, pp. 1-6. IEEE, 2011.
[16] F. Kuhn, R. !Wattenhofer, A. Zollinger, Asymptotically optimal geometirc mobile ad-hoc routing. 6th international workshop on discrete algorithms and methods for mobile computing and communications, 2002.
[17] B. Leong, S. Mitra, B. Liskov, Path Vector Face Routing:Geographic Routing with Local Face Information. Boston, MA: 13th IEEE International Conference on Network Protocols, 2005

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

Procedia Computer Science 00 (2014) 1–2

Procedia Computer Science

arXiv:1412.8222v1 [cs.NI] 28 Dec 2014

Hole Representation and Shape Free Geographic Routing in Wireless Sensor Networks

Jianjun Yang[a], Zongming Fei[b], Ju Shen[c], Juan Guo[d]

[a]*Department of Computer Science and Information Systems, University of North Georgia, Oakwood, GA. Email: jianjun.yang@ung.edu*
[b]*Department of Computer Science, University of Kentucky, Lexington,KY. Email: fei@netlab.uky.edu*
[c]*Department of Computer Science, University of Dayton, Dayton, OH. Email: jshen1@udayton.edu*
[d]*Department of Computer Science and Information Systems, University of North Georgia, Dahlonega, GA. Email: jianjun.yang@ung.edu*

Abstract

In wireless sensor networks, an important issue of Geographic Routing is "local minimum" problem, which is caused by "hole" that blocks the greedy forwarding process. Existing geographic routing algorithms use perimeter routing strategies to find a long detour path when such a situation occurs. To avoid the long detour path, recent research focuses on detecting the hole in advance, then the nodes located on the boundary of the hole advertise the hole information to the nodes near the hole. Hence the long detour path can be avoided in future routing. We propose a heuristic hole detecting algorithm which can identify the hole easily and quickly. In addition, we quantitatively figure out the areas in the vicinity of the hole that need to be announced the hole information. With such information, a new routing scheme was developed. The routing path is independent on the shape of the hole. Simulation results illustrate that our approach can achieve better performance in terms of the average length and number of hops of routing paths. Simulation also shows that our approach introduces very small computational complexity.

© 2011 Published by Elsevier Ltd.

Keywords: Hole, Geographic Routing, Wireless Sensor Networks

1. Introduction

An ad hoc network consists of a collection of wireless communication nodes. Two nodes within a certain distance of each other can communicate directly. However, if a source node wants to send packets to a destination outside of its ransmission range, it will depend on other nodes to relay the packets, because no fixed infrastructure exists in the ad hoc network. Many routing protocols (e.g., DSDV [1], AODV [2]) have been proposed for wireless ad hoc networks to find the path from the source to the destination. The main issue with hese routing schemes is the scalability because most of them have to use flooding to find routing paths.

When the location information for nodes is available (either through GPS or using virtual coordinates [3]), routing in ad hoc netowrks can be much more efficient. Geographic routing exploits the location information and makes the routing in ad hoc networks scalable. The source node first acquires the location of the destination node it wants to communicate with, then forwards the packet to its neighbor closest to the destination. This process is repeated until the packet reaches the destination. A path is found via a series of independent local decisions rather than flooding. However, geographic routing suffers from the so-called local minimum phenomenon, in which a packet may get stuck at a node that does not have a closer neighbor to the destination, even though there is a path from the source to destination in the network. This typically happens when there is a void area (or hole) that has no active nodes. In

wireless ad hoc network, the holes are caused by various reasons [4]. For instance, the malicious nodes can jam the communication to form Jamming Holes. If the signal of nodes is not long enough to cover everywhere in the network plane, the Coverage Holes may exist. Moreover, Routing Holes can be formed either due to voids in node deployment or because of failure of nodes due to various reasons such as malfunctioning, or battery depletion.

To deal with the local minimum problem, Karp and Kung proposed the Greedy Perimeter Stateless Routing (GPSR) protocol, which guarantees the delivery of the packet if a path exists [5]. When a packet is stuck at a node, the protocol will route the packet around the faces of the graph to get out of the local minimum. Several approaches were proposed that are originated from the face routing. Although they can find the available routing paths, they often cause the long detour paths.


d
v
a
b
g
p
h


d
c
b
a
p
s


Average hop of hole paths
Number of nodes
GPSR
HDAR
0
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
50
100
150
200
250
300


Average length of hole paths
900
800
700
600
500
400
300
200
100
50
100
150
200
250
300
Number of nodes
GPSR
HDAR


k’
e’
a
e
f’
b
f
g
p
h
k


b
f
f’
k
n
k’
e
e’
a
p


r
d
t
n
m
a
b
c
j
e
f
g
p
h
k
s

HDAR: Hole Detection and Adaptive Routing for Geographic Ad Hoc Networks

Jianjun Yang and Zongming Fei
Department of Computer Science, University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506-0046, USA

Abstract

In wireless ad-hoc networks, an important issue of Geographic Routing is "local minimum" problem, which is caused by "hole" that blocks the greedy forwarding process. Existing geographic routing algorithms use perimeter routing strategies to find a long detour path when such a situation occurs. To avoid the long detour path, recent research focuses on detecting the hole in advance, then the nodes located on the boundary of the hole advertise the hole information to the nodes near the hole. Hence the long detour path can be avoided in future routing. We propose a heuristic hole detecting algorithm which can identify the hole easily and quickly. In addition, we quantitatively figure out the areas in the vicinity of the hole that need to be announced the hole information. With such information, a new routing scheme was developed. Simulation results illustrate that our approach can achieve better performance in terms of the average length and number of hops of routing paths. Simulation also shows that our approach introduces very small computational complexity.

1 Introduction

Geographic routing is a simple, scalable and efficient routing strategy in wireless networks. It has been considered as the most promising routing scheme in ad-hoc networks. In such a scheme, the location information for nodes is available either through GPS or using virtual coordinates [6]. And it is assumed that each node knows its own location and the locations of its neighbors. The source node knows the location of the destination node and encapsulates it in each data packet. In the basic greedy forwarding approach, a node sends data packets to one of its neighbors who is closest to the destination until the packets reach the destination node. This mechanism can minimize the hops from the source to the destination. However, there existing a challenge often faced in geographic greedy routing is "local minimum problem", in which the greedy forwarding process is blocked at a node that does not have a closer neighbor to the destination, even though there is a path from the source to destination in the network. The occurrence of hole can be caused by many factors in wireless ad hoc networks, such as the jamming hole incurred by jam communication, the sparse deployment, the physical obstacles and power exhaustion [1].

To overcome the local minimum issue, Greedy Perimeter Stateless Routing (GPSR) [4], Greedy-Face-Greedy(GFG) [11], and Greedy-Other-Adaptive-Face Routing(GOAFR) [2] are proposed. When a forwarding packet gets stuck at a local minimum node, it will start a perimeter routing phase where the packet will be forwarded along the perimeter of the hole, until it reaches a node that can find one of its neighbors that is closer to the destination than itself. After that,the forwarding mode returns to greedy. The face routing family schemes can guarantee delivery. However,they often cause long detour path in the perimeter routing, although the shorter path exists.

To avoid the long detour path, recent work tries to detect the hole and the nodes located on the hole's boundary in advance, then these nodes advertise the hole information to some other nodes [3] [12]. So the future routing path can be adaptive in the presence of the hole.

Our algorithms HDAR in this paper focus on defining and detecting holes in ad hoc network, representing holes and building routes around the holes. The contributions of this paper are threefold. First, we come up with a heuristic algorithm to detect a hole quickly and easily. And the hole can be identified only by one time calculation. Second, we provide a very concise format to represent the hole. A hole is represented only by a segment. Third, we develop an approach to make part of the nodes located on the hole's boundary announce to the nodes in the vicinity of the hole. We found the best tradeoff between the cost of hole information announcement and benefit for future routing. Simulation shows that compared with GPSR, HDAR reduces the length of routing path by 12.4% and forwarding hops by 13.2% for all the paths in tested areas. And the length of long detour paths around the hole can be reduced 61.2%. The number of hops can be reduced 64.6% compared with GPSR. Simulation also indicates that the compu-

tational complexity of HDAR is only 16.6% that of HAGR.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses related work. Section 3 proposes a novel method for detecting holes and presents a new adaptive routing algorithm. We evaluate the proposed schemes by simulations and describe the performance results in Section 4. Section 5 further discusses the hole detection and related methods. Section 6 concludes the paper. The deduction of the hole announcement size is introduced in the appendix.

2 Related Work

The first geographic routing protocol is based on simple greedy forwarding. In this approach, each node forwards packets to one of its neighbors who is closest to the destination node until the packets arrive the destination. This scheme is efficient. However, it fails due to the "local minimum problem".

To mitigate "local minimum problem", compass routing [7] was proposed as the first face routing, in which the packet is forwarded along the face until greedy is workable in a node. However, compass routing cannot guarantee packet delivery in all geographic networks. Several routing algorithms in face routing family have been developed. By combining greedy and face routing, Karp and Kung proposed the Greedy Perimeter Stateless Routing (GPSR) algorithm [4]. It consists of the greedy forwarding mode and the perimeter forwarding mode, which is applied in the regions where the greedy forwarding does not work. An enhanced algorithm, called Adaptive Face Routing (AFR), uses an eclipse to restrict the search area during routing so that in the worst case, the total routing cost is no worse than a constant factor of the cost for the optimal route [8]. The latest addition to the face routing family is Path Vector Face Routing(GPVFR) [9], which improves routing efficiency by exploiting local face information. The protocols in face routing family can avoid the hole. However, they often cause long detour path.

A new idea was proposed recently, which is to detect the hole in advance, then the nodes located on the hole advertise the hole information to other nodes. The hole information will benefit nodes who receive it for their future routing. Qing gave a mathematical definition of hole [3]. He defined a hole to be a simple region enclosed by a polygon cycle which contains all the nodes where local minimum can appear. He brought forth the "get stuck" concept and proposed the hole detection mechanism that once a packet following geographic greedy forwarding gets stuck at a node, the node must be on the boundary of a hole. Also related is HAGR [12]. HAGR investigated the nodes incident to a close loop in a geographical graph. For a vertex u, if the angle between two adjacent edges with respect to this vertex is larger than an angle threshold, then vertex u considers it is located on a potential hole. To further determine if it is located on a hole, u calculates the diameter of the loop. It locates the bisector that equally splits the angle and uses it as a reference line. Then node u finds out the leftmost node and the rightmost node furthest from the bisector. The distance between the leftmost node and the rightmost node is the diameter of the hole. If the diameter is greater than the diameter threshold and the angle is bigger than the angle threshold, u is regarded as sitting on a hole. Once a node is detected on a hole, it advertises the hole information to its neighbors. Upon receiving the hole information, its neighbor recalculates the angle and diameter based on its location. If both of them are bigger than their thresholds, then the neighbor considers it is on a hole and it continues to advertises the hole information, otherwise it stops advertisement. Base on the hole detecting, HAGR divides the network plane into three regions, and the nodes in different regions conduct different forwarding strategies. The idea of HAGR is novel. However, the hole detecting approach is time-consuming since a node has to calculate the values of two metrics. And the hole advertisement is expensive because once a node receives the hole information, it has to recalculate two values and compare them with their corresponding thresholds. In addition, the diameter threshold is an absolute value and it has to be adjusted according to the nodes' transmission range or the network deployment, otherwise false negative or false positive may occur. Moreover, the forwarding strategies are too complicated.

3 Hole Detecting and Adaptive Routing

3.1 Hole Detection Algorithm

In HDAR, a node p begins to detect whether it is located on a hole only if the angle between its two adjacent edges is greater than 120 degrees [3]. p initiates a probe message and writes its location to this message. Then p sends the message to its leftmost node respect to the angle. Where the leftmost node is defined as: p faces the area formed by the two rays of this angle, then p uses the angle's bisector line to conduct anti-clockwise sweeping, the leftmost node is the first one that met by the sweeping line. Upon receiving the probe message, p's leftmost neighbor node writes its location into the message and passes it to its leftmost neighbor, here the leftmost or rightmost neighbor is defined similarly. The probe message will finally come back to node p from p's rightmost neighbor respect to the initial invested angle [3] [12]. When the probe message circulates, it collects the locations of the nodes on its way. So node p knows all the nodes' locations on the way.

p then begins to investigate the nodes on the way ordered clockwisely. For each node on the way, p computes the length of their probe path $length_pro()$ and

their Euclidean distance $dist_euc()$. For a node x, $length_pro(p,x)/dist_euc(p,x)$ is defined as hole detection ratio p to x. If there exists a node v, the hole detection ratio p to whom is larger than a predefined threshold δ, that is,

$$length_pro(p,v)/dist_euc(p,v) > \delta \qquad (1)$$

is satisfied, then p is considered sitting on a hole. The value of δ affects the hole detection results. Too big value of δ introduces false negative and too small value of δ causes false positive. We derived that δ=2.25 is a good choice to detect most holes that will block greedy forwarding. Fig. 1 is an example for hole detection. Node p initiates the hole probe message. p collects the nodes' locations during the message circulates the loop. Then p finds that there exists a node v, satisfying $length_pro(p,v)/dist_euc(p,v) > 2.25$, p is considered sitting on a hole.



Figure 1. P initiates the probe message and it circulates the loop

The hole that was detected is a polygon. Note that some nodes located on the polygon measure they are located on a hole, but other nodes may not consider they are on a hole. For instance, in Fig. 1, node g, p and h consider they are on a hole since there exist nodes on the polygon's boundary to let them satisfy the hole definition (1). However, the vertexes a and b at the hole polygon found by p don't consider they are on a hole because a or b's greedy forwarding will not be blocked by the polygon.

The node located on the polygon may detect the hole repeatedly, thus a lot of overhead will be generated. Fortunately, the overhead can be reduced because of the 802.11 MAC layer random backoff mechanism. In this mechanism, one will not send out a packet if it overhears an RTS sent to other node. Instead, it will wait for a period and then begin to send out its packet only when it hears the CTS plus a period. We use this mechanism that once a node hears a probe message, it would not schedule a probe message although it has not sent out its probe message yet. However, a node sitting on the polygon may only receive partial of the nodes' information based on this mechanism if the received probe does not start from this node. In order to make each node know the locations of all the nodes on the polygon, the probe initiating node sends two probe messages clockwise and anti-clockwise at the same time.(shown in Fig. 1). So each node on the polygon can obtain the whole information of the polygon. Since the probe message is sent by both clockwise and anti-clockwise directions, there will be two probe paths, we choose the longer as the length of the probe path to calculate the hole detection ratio.

The probe message initiating algorithm is described as Fig. 2.

Probe_msg_initiating()
- **if** doesn't receive a probe message
  - **S**earch whether it has an angle between two adjacent edges larger than 120 degrees;
  - **if** true
    - Initiate a probe message;
    - Write its location to this message;
    - Send it to its left node and right node of the angle.

Figure 2. Probe Message Initiating Algorithm

The probe message receiving algorithm is described as Fig. 3. In this algorithm, upon receiving a probe message, a node determines whether it is the message initiate node. If it is, the node will calculate the hole detection ratio when both probe massages come back. If the node is not the message initiate node, it will write its location to the message and forward the message.

Probe_msg_receiving()
- Compare its location with the message initiator's location to determine whether it is the message initiator
- **if** it is the initiator
  - Search whether the two probe message from different directions both reached it;
  - **if** true
    - Calculate the hole detection ratio
  - **else**
    - Wait for the second probe message;
- **else**
  - Write its location;
  - Forward the message to its left or right neighbor according to the forwarding direction.

Figure 3. Probe Message Receiving Algorithm

The probe initiator must have an angle between two adjacent edges with respect to it that is larger than 120 degrees. However, such an angle is necessary but not sufficient condition to determine the initiator is a local minimum node, but this does not affect our hole detection results since the initial node being regarded as a local minimum is independent on the fact that the node detects a hole. A relative

destination is needed to determine a local minimum but our hole detection algorithm does not need a specific destination. The objective of the hole probe message is to find a hole, but not to determine if the probe initiator is a local minimum node.

The probe initiator who finds a hole finally may be or may not be a local minimum node. In Fig. 1, node p initiates the hole probe message and finds that it is located on a hole. It is a local minimum node if it sends a packet to nodes in the vicinity of node d. In Fig. 4, node p initiates a hole probe message and detects the hole, but p is not a local minimum node. The hole information will be announced to the nodes in a certain area and these nodes will be benefited from the hole announcement for future routing.

In Fig. 5, p is a local minimum node. p initiates a hole probe message but it cannot detect the hole because the length of the probe path from p to any node on the polygon over their Euclidean distance is approximate to 1. However, the hole can be detected by another node such as n and the hole information will be announced to areas(ekf and $e^{'}k^{'}f^{'}$) containing the nodes which will be benefited from the hole information in future routing. This phenomenon that a true local minimum node p cannot detect a hole occurs when the polygon is long and narrow then the initiator's routing will not be blocked by the polygon. So this detecting result has very minor effect to p's forwarding. Nevertheless, the hole will be detected by another node who suffers from the hole.



Figure 4. P is not a local minimum but finds the hole

3.2 Shape-Free Hole Representation

The hole that is detected is a polygon. The representation of a polygon is a sequence of vertexes. However, in geographic routing, we don't have to care all the nodes on the polygon because most of them have minor effect to determine the routing paths. What we concern are the nodes that will block the greedy forwarding. In our model, since p has already obtained all the nodes' locations on the polygon(Fig. 4), p calculates the two nodes whose Euclidean distance is most remote. The segment connecting these two nodes looks like a board that blocks the greedy forwarding. For instance, segment ab in Fig. 4 is the board that blocks the greedy forwarding. Then the hole is represented as $< a, b >$. No matter what the shape of the hole is, what we concern is the segment connecting the two most remote nodes.



Figure 5. P is a local minimum but does not find the hole

3.3 Determining the Shaded Area

That the greedy forwarding is blocked by the board $< a, b >$ is because some potential destination nodes are hidden behind the board, and the source nodes located in a certain area that is in the opposite side to the hidden destinations are not aware of them. In the basic routing approach, a source node just conducts the greedy forwarding until it fails due to the local minimum node, where the greedy forwarding changes to face forwarding. Thus the detour paths are generated. If the possible destination nodes hidden behind the board can be figured out in advance and be announced to the source nodes in the certain area, the length of the routing paths can be dramatically reduced. We determine the possible destination area(shaded area) as follows: Draw line ar perpendicular to segment ab, r and p are at the opposite sides of ab. Also draw line bt perpendicular to line ab, t and p are at the opposite sides of ab. Then the area $rabt$ is the shaded area(Fig. 6).

3.4 Hole Announcement

The nodes in area $rabt$ are the possible destination nodes associated with some source nodes. We would like to figure out an area containing these source nodes that will be announced the hole information in the opposite side of $rabt$(Fig. 6). The hole information will help the nodes adaptively adjust the next forwarding hops to avoid detour routing paths. In order to determine the hole announcement area, the announcement breadth and depth need to be figured out. We first find node e and node f at the same side as node p relative to segment ab that are the left and right nodes furthest away from each other and satisfy the hole detection condition (1). Let c be the midpoint of segment ef. Draw segment ck perpendicular to ef. Then the triangle efk is the area that should be announced the hole information. Note that hole announcement area is larger, more nodes will be advertised the hole information and the future routing path will be shorter. However, the area is larger, more overheads will be introduced. So there is a tradeoff between the benefit to the future routing path and the overhead. The optimal values of the hole information announcement size that can both shorten the future routing path and reduce the overhead need to be found. The announcement breadth is selected as segment ef since e and f are most remote nodes on the hole's boundary located on the same side of p satisfying the hole detection condition. So the announcement depth determines the size of the area. We let the length of ec be l and mark $\angle cek$ to be α. Assume that the nodes are distributed in the plane uniformly. So the number of the nodes in $\triangle$ekf can be represented by the area of $\triangle$ekf:

$\frac{1}{2}\cdot 2l\cdot l\tan\alpha = l^2\tan\alpha, \alpha \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$

For node s, if it intends to send a packet to node d by HDAR routing protocol, the path includes the sub-paths $s \rightarrow k$, $k \rightarrow e$, $e \rightarrow a$ and $a \rightarrow d$. The last two sub-paths are fixed, but $s \rightarrow k$ and $k \rightarrow e$ depend on α. Let the length of sc be h, we approximately represent the length of path sk by $h - \mid kc \mid = h - l\tan\alpha$, and the length of path $k \rightarrow e$ by $\mid ke \mid$ since the routing path generated by HDAR will be along ke. Here $\mid ke \mid$ is $\frac{l}{\cos\alpha}$. Hence from s to e, the length of paths is:

$(h - l\tan\alpha) + \frac{l}{\cos\alpha}$

We want to find an α that can try to minimize both the area of $\triangle$ekf and the length of routing path. The optimal value to minimize both is depended on α. We deduced that the best solution is that when α is 1.05. We approximate the length of $ef(2l)$ to be $\mid ab \mid$. Then the optimal length of the depth ck is $\tan\alpha * \frac{1}{2} \mid ef \mid$, that is: $0.87* \mid ab \mid$. The details will be discussed in the appendix.

The nodes on the arc ef begin to advertise the hole information $< a, b >$ to their neighbors. In order to avoid duplicate messages, once a node in the area has received the hole information, it simply discards the duplicate. After the advertisement of hole's information, each node in the area efk knows that any possible destination node in area $rabt$ is hidden behind the the board $< a, b >$(The red nodes and boundary nodes from e to f in Fig. 6) .



Figure 6. Hole Announcement

3.5 Adaptive routing

After the announcement, each node in the triangle ekf knows that there is a hole $< a, b >$ that blocks the greedy forwarding to any destination node in area $rabt$. So the nodes in triangle ekf can adaptively adjust the routing path. In the network plane, once a node s intends to send a packet with destination d, it first looks up its local cache to see whether it has a hole information entry $< a, b >$. If there is no such entry in its local cache, it just conducts GPSR. Else if there is a hole information entry $< a, b >$ but s and d are located at the same side of segment ab, s just conducts GPSR. If s and d are located on the opposite sides of ab but d is not in the shaded area $rabt$, s just conducts GPSR. Else d must be in the area $rabt$. In this situation, s wants to consider a or b as its tentative target and then writes a or b to the packet's head as a tentative target. In order to make s determine which one should be the tentative target, let m be the midpoint of segment ab, mn is perpendicular to segment ab and n is at the opposite side of ab compared with s. Then if d is located in area $ramn$, s writes a to the packet's head as its tentative target. If d is located in area $nmbt$, s writes b to the packet's head as its tentative target. When the packet reaches a or b, the tentative target will continue sending the packet to the destination node d.

When a node is forwarding a packet to its next hop, it

calls $HDAR_forwarding()$ described in Fig. 7.

HDAR_forwarding()

Look at the forwarding packet whether this node has a tentative target $\mathcal{T}$
if true
  Compare whether this node is $\mathcal{T}$;
  if true
    Remove $\mathcal{T}$ and forward the packet to next hop with its destination d;
  else
    Forward the packet to next hop with its destination $\mathcal{T}$;
else
  Search its local cache
  if an entry $< a, b >$ exists
    if this node and d are at the same side of ab
      Conduct GPSR;
    if this node and d are at opposite sides of ab
      if d is in $ramn$
        Write a as tentative target $\mathcal{T}$ to the packet;
        Forward packet to next hop with destination $\mathcal{T}$;
      if d is in $nmbt$
        Write b as tentative target $\mathcal{T}$ to the packet;
        Forward packet to next hop with destination $\mathcal{T}$;
      else
        Conduct GPSR;
  else
    Conduct GPSR.

Figure 7. HDAR Forwarding Algorithm

4 Performance Evaluation

Our simulations were performed by using the easim3D wireless network simulator [10], which is to simulate IEEE 802.11 radios and typically for location based routing algorithms. We use a noiseless immobile radio network environment. In the simulations, nodes with a transmission radius of 20 meters are deployed in an interest area of 400mX400m.

We generated networks with the number of nodes varied from 50 to 300. For a certain number, 50 networks were generated randomly. And the holes were generated automatically in each network.

Our experiments include two parts. The first part is to compare GPSR and HDAR. We implemented GPSR that is previously implemented by Karp and Kung [4]. We compare GPSR and HDAR by two metrics, the length of routing paths and the number of hops.

Fig. 8 indicates the average length of paths when the number of nodes changes from 50 to 300. The average length in HDAR is 12.4% shorter than that of GPSR. Fig. 9 shows the average number of hops in HDAR is 13.2% less than that of GPSR.



Figure 8. The average length of paths.



Figure 9. The average number of hops.



Figure 10. The average length of hole paths.



Figure 11. The average number of hops of hole paths.

In the statistics results of Fig. 8 and Fig. 9, the results report both the greedy path and the path in the vicinity of holes. So HDAR's effect to the path near the holes cannot be emphasized. To demonstrate HDAR's effect, we tipically marked the paths that benefit from the hole information as "hole paths" and recorded the pairs of source and destination nodes. We also investigated the paths generated by GPSR with the same pairs of source and destination nodes. Then we compared the paths benefit from hole information in HDAR with the paths derived from GPSR.

The performance of HDAR and GPSR to the hole paths are reported in Fig. 10 and Fig. 11. HDAR has much shorter paths and fewer hops compared with GPSR. For the hole path paths, the average length of HDAR is only 38.8% that of GPSR and the number of hops is only 35.4%. The two figures indicate that that HDAR reduces the long detour paths around holes significantly.

The second part is to compare the computational complexity of HARG and our algorithm HDAR. We used the same networks in part 1. Since HARG has not been simulated yet in the paper [12], we selected $5\pi/6$ as the hole detection threshold and 60 meters as the diameter threshold. In both HARG and HDAR, we investigated the number of computation times of hole detection. In HDAR, the hole information is only calculated by a few nodes located on the hole and other nodes are advertised the hole information. While in HARG, a number of nodes have to calculate to determine the existing of a hole. The numbers of calculation times were reported to evaluate the computational complexity. Fig. 12 illustrates that the computational complexity of HDAR is much less than that of HARG.



Figure 12. The computational complexity.

5 Discussion

In this section, we will discuss the method how to figure out the value of δ, the situations that will cause false positive or false negative when detecting holes and two types of special circumstances about the hole representation.

5.1 Derivation of the threshold

In geographic routing, when a hole exists, there will be a detour path. So we attempt to detect a hole by finding a detour path. The "detour" path is defined as the routing path between two nodes that is much longer than their Euclidean distance in this paper. In order to quantitatively represent the "much longer", we introduce a threshold δ that is $length_pro()/dist_euc()$. To determine the value of δ, we first attempt a polygon like a circle(Fig. 13) in which δ is $\pi/2 = 1.57$. However, the circle is not a hole, so we will investigate $\delta > 1.57$.

We then increase the value of δ. Suppose triangle abp is a regular triangle(Fig. 14), the length of each edge is 1, and the transmission range is slightly less than 1, such as 0.9. Then we move a to $a^{'}$ and let both $a^{'}p$ and $a^{'}b$ be equal to the transmission range. Then from p to b, a path $p \rightarrow a' \rightarrow b$ exists and it is a slight detour path. But the triangle is not a hole since none of the three nodes is a local minimum node.



Figure 13. A circle is not a hole

In this circumstance, the value of δ is approximate equal to 2.



Figure 14. A regular triangle is not a hole

Then we increase the value of δ to the one that is slightly larger than 2. We found that δ =2.25 is a good choice for small false positive and small false negative by experimental attempts.

5.2 Discussion of false positive and false negative

The false negative and false positive may occur during the hole detection. The false negative occurs when the Euclidean distance from a source node to the destination node is close to the transmission range and the detour path is slightly larger than the Euclidean distance. For instance, in Fig. 15, the transmission range is 0.9,$\mid pd \mid$=0.95, $\mid ad \mid$=$\mid bd \mid$=1,$\mid ed \mid$=$\mid df \mid$=0.9 and $\mid ap \mid$=$\mid pb \mid$=0.9. Then p is a local minimum node and the polygon $paedfb$ is a hole. However, HDAR does not detect it is a hole. The false negative is introduced by a very special circumstance that the detour path is about one hop distance longer than the Euclidean distance. If the detour is longer, then δ will be greater than 2.25 and the polygon will be considered as a hole. If the Euclidean distance from p to d is much larger than the transmission range, the polygon is a long and narrow area. The δ will be less than 2.25 from p's point of view. But node e or f will detect the long and narrow polygon is a hole. The false negative in Fig. 15 will not affect the routing too much because the detour is not too long, normally one hop.



Figure 15. False negative when detecting hole by HDAR

False positive occurs when Euclidean distance from a source node to the destination node is slightly larger than the transmission range and the detour path is at least three hops long, and each hop is close to the transmission range. For instance, in Fig. 16, the transmission range is 0.9,$\mid pd \mid$=1, $\mid ed \mid$=0.95, and $\mid ep \mid$=$\mid ea \mid$=$\mid ad \mid$=$\mid dc \mid$=$\mid cb \mid$=0.9. Where p is not a local minimum node and then the polygon $peadcb$ is not a hole by hole's original definition. However, HDAR detects it is a hole. And node e and p will advertise the hole information to an area epk. The area to be announced is not big since only a few nodes(two nodes in this example) announce the hole information. If there are more nodes located in any edge such as ea or ep, then the polygon is a true hole. Although this is a "pseudo hole" detected by HDAR, the nodes in epk will benefit from the hole information. For example, if s wants to send a packet to d, s will send the packet to a directly(green path) instead of detour from p(red paths). The false positive will occur in very special situations. And the further hole announcement to a small area is not an expensive task. But the nodes in this area will benefit from the hole information.

5.3 Further discussion of the hole representation

The hole is represented by a segment that connects the most remote two nodes of the hole in this paper. However, there may be a second segment that is a little shorter than the segment standing for the hole and they are almost perpendicular. We will discuss how this situation affects the future routing by two types of hole shapes.



Figure 16. False positive when detecting hole by HDAR

In the first type, the shape of hole is a convex polygon(Fig. 17). ef represents the hole. There is a second segment ch that is a little shorter than ef. We fit this polygon by a circle. When node a intends to send a packet to node d, who is on the same side of a relative to ef, only GPSR can be used in our routing protocol. Since a and d are located on the boundary of a circle, a can always find another node b or c or g that is closer to d as its next hop. So greedy forwarding is available. In this circumstance, no matter which segment representing the hole will not affect the future routing.



Figure 17. The polygon is fitted as a circle

The hole is concave in the second type(Fig. 18). ef represents the hole. There is a second segment ch that is a little shorter than ef. We fit this polygon by a 3-regular tree in Poincare disk [5]. It can be considered as two sets of hyperbola. They divided the plane into four regions I,II,III and IV by arc fh,fc, ce and eh excluding the hole. We illustrate that the possible detour will not be too much by an example node a. When a located in region III wants to send a packet to node b, a finds that e is the tentative target and the path is constructed by ae and eb, both are greedy. When a sends a packet to g, since a and g are on the same side of segment ef, a uses greedy to reach k, then from k to c by face routing and from c to g by greedy. When a sends a packet to d, a considers f as tentative target. Then the path will be constructed by aj,jc,cf and fd, where jc is face routing path. So no matter what regions the source and destination nodes are located, there is at most one piece of face routing path included in one region. And it will not be two long.



Figure 18. The polygon is fitted as hyperbolas

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we presented a heuristic algorithm that detects the hole. The hole can be represented concisely and announced to the nodes nearby that potentially incur detour paths by face routing. The node benefited from the hole information can adaptively adjust the forwarding hop to avoid long detour path. The novelty of the approach is that a single node can detect the hole efficiently and then the nodes near the hole can benefit from it. The experiments indicate that our approach results in significant shorter routing path and fewer hops than an existing geographic routing algorithm. And it only causes few computational complexities.

References

[1] N. Ahmed, S. Kanhere, and S. Jha. The holes problem in wireless sensor networks: a survey. *SIGMOBILE Mobile Computing and Communications Review*, vol.9:4–18, April 2005.

[2] R. W. F. Kuhn and A. Zollinger. *Worst-case optimal and average-case efficient geometric ad-hoc routing*. 4th ACM International Symposium on Mobile Ad Hoc Networking and Computing, 2003.

[3] Q. Fang, J. Gao, and L. Guibas. Locating and bypassing holes in sensor networks. *Mobile Networks and Applications*, vol.11:187–200, April 2006.

[4] B. Karp and H. Kung. *GPSR: Greedy perimeter stateless routing for wireless networks*. ACM/IEEE International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking, 2000.

[5] R. Kleinberg. *Geographic Routing Using Hyperbolic Space*. INFOCOM. 26th IEEE International Conference, 2007.

[6] Y.-B. Ko and N. H. Vaidya. *Location-aided routing (LAR) in mobile ad hoc networks*. ACM/IEEE MobiCom, 1998.
[7] E. Kranakis, H. Singh, and J. Urrutia. *Compass routing on geometric networks*. 11-th Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry, 1999.
[8] F. Kuhn, R. Wattenhofer, and A. Zollinger. *Asymptotically optimal geometirc mobile ad-hoc routing*. 6th international workshop on discrete algorithms and methods for mobile computing and communications, 2002.
[9] B. Leong, S. Mitra, and B. Liskov. *Path Vector Face Routing:Geographic Routing with Local Face Information*. 13th IEEE International Conference on Network Protocols, Boston, MA, 2005.
[10] C. Liu. *Simulator in Department of Computer Science and Engineering at Florida Atlantic University*. $Http$: $//www.geocities.com/gzcliu_proj/index.htm$.
[11] P. M. P. Bose and I. Stojmenovic. *Routing with guaranteed delivery in ad hoc wireless networks*. 3rd International Workshop on Discrete Algorithms and Methods for Mobile Computing and Communications, 1999.
[12] F. Xing, Y. Xu, M. Zhao, and K. Harfoush. *HAGR: Hole Aware Greedy Routing for Geometric Ad Hoc Networks*. Military Communications Conference, 2007.

7 Appendix: calculation of hole announcement depth

In section3.4, we announced that the best depth to advertise the hole information was $0.87* \mid ab \mid$. Then we use Fig. 19 to illustrate how we drive this value.



Figure 19. P initiates the probe message and it circulates the loop

In Fig. 19, $< a, b >$ is to represent the hole and it will be announced to some nodes in a vicinity area of the hole at the same side of p.

The hole information will help the nodes adaptively adjust the next forwarding node and avoid detour routing path. In order to determine the hole announcement area, the announcement breadth and depth need to be figured out.

We first find node e and node f at the same side as node p relative to ab that are the pair of furthest nodes satisfying the hole detection condition (1). Let c be the midpoint of segment ef. Draw segment ck perpendicular to ef. Then the triangle efk is the area that should be announced the hole information. The hole announcement area is larger, more nodes will benefit the hole information and the future routing path will be shorter. However, the area is larger, more overheads will be introduced. So there is a tradeoff between the length of the future routing path and the overhead.

The optimal values of the hole information announcement size that can both shorten the future routing path and reduce the overhead need to be found.

Let $\mid ab \mid$ be L. Let $\mid ec \mid$ be l. Let $\angle cek$ be α. So the number of the nodes in $\triangle$ekf can be represented by the area of $\triangle$ekf:

$\frac{1}{2} \cdot 2l \cdot l \tan\alpha = l^2 \tan\alpha, \alpha \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$

We represent the length of path sk by $h - \mid kc \mid = h - l\tan\alpha$, and the length of path $k \rightarrow e$ by $\mid ke \mid$ since the routing path generated by HDAR will be along ke. Here $\mid ke \mid$ is $\frac{l}{\cos\alpha}$. Hence from s to e, the length of paths is:

$(h - l\tan\alpha) + \frac{l}{\cos\alpha}$

What we want to achieve is:

$argMin(l^2 \tan\alpha \cdot ((h - l\tan\alpha) + \frac{l}{\cos\alpha})^2)$
$= argMin(l^2h^2 \tan\alpha + l^4 \tan^3\alpha - 2hl^3 \tan^2\alpha$
$+ \frac{l^4 \tan\alpha}{\cos^2\alpha} + \frac{2hl^3 \tan\alpha}{\cos\alpha} - \frac{2l^4 \tan^2\alpha}{\cos\alpha})$

Let $(l^2h^2 \tan\alpha + l^4 \tan^3\alpha - 2hl^3 \tan^2\alpha + \frac{l^4 \tan\alpha}{\cos^2\alpha} + \frac{2hl^3 \tan\alpha}{\cos\alpha} - \frac{2l^4 \tan^2\alpha}{\cos\alpha})$ be $g(\alpha)$.

If there exists α_0, α_1 and α_2 satisfying:

$g(\alpha_1)' = 0$,
$g(\alpha_0)' < 0$,
and $g(\alpha_2)' > 0$

then the expected α can be derived. The depth of hole information announcement is:

$1.74 * l = 1.74 * \frac{L}{2} = 0.87L$.

The announcement breadth is selected as segment ef. So the announcement depth determines the size of the area. Let $\mid ab \mid$ be L. Let $\mid ec \mid$ be l. Let $\angle cek$ be α. Then the objectives are to minimize the number of nodes in the triangle ekf and minimize the length of the path from s to d. Assume that the nodes are distributed in the plane uniformly. So the number of the nodes in $\triangle$ekf can be represented by the area of $\triangle$ekf:

$\frac{1}{2} \cdot 2l \cdot l \tan\alpha = l^2 \tan\alpha, \alpha \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ (2)

For node s, if it intends to send a packet to node d, the path includes the sub-paths $s \rightarrow k$, $k \rightarrow e$, $e \rightarrow a$ and $a \rightarrow d$. The last two sub-paths are fixed, but $s \rightarrow k$

and $k \rightarrow e$ depend on α. Assume the length of sc to be h. We approximately represent the length of path sk by $h-\mid kc \mid = h - l\tan\alpha$, and the length of path $k \rightarrow e$ by $\mid ke \mid$ since the routing path generated by HDAR will be along ke. Here $\mid ke \mid$ is $\frac{l}{\cos\alpha}$. Hence from s to e, the length of paths is:

$(h - l\tan\alpha) + \frac{l}{\cos\alpha}$ (3)

We want to find an α that can try to minimize both (2)and(3). Since (2) is quadratic to l but (3) is linear to l, so what we want to achieve is:

$argMin((2) * (3)^2)$, that is:

$argMin(l^2\tan\alpha \cdot ((h - l\tan\alpha) + \frac{l}{\cos\alpha})^2)$

$=argMin(l^2h^2\tan\alpha + l^4\tan^3\alpha - 2hl^3\tan^2\alpha + \frac{l^4\tan\alpha}{\cos^2\alpha} + \frac{2hl^3\tan\alpha}{\cos\alpha} - \frac{2l^4\tan^2\alpha}{\cos\alpha})$

Let $(l^2h^2\tan\alpha + l^4\tan^3\alpha - 2hl^3\tan^2\alpha + \frac{l^4\tan\alpha}{\cos^2\alpha} + \frac{2hl^3\tan\alpha}{\cos\alpha} - \frac{2l^4\tan^2\alpha}{\cos\alpha})$ be $g(\alpha)$.

Let $h = 2l, 2.5l, 3l, 3.5l, 4l$ respectively, if there exists α_0, α_1 and α_2 satisfying:

$g(\alpha_1)' = 0$,

$g(\alpha_0)' < 0$,

and $g(\alpha_2)' > 0$

where α_0 is minor smaller than α_1,α_2 is minor larger than α_1, then the expected α can be derived. Unfortunately, when $g(\alpha_1)' = 0$, $\alpha \notin [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$. We substitute the series values of h to $g(\alpha)$, then achieve the minimal values of $g(\alpha)$ and their corresponding values of α. The average value of α is 1.05. $\tan 1.05 = 1.74$, so the depth of hole information announcement is:

$1.74 * l = 1.74 * \frac{L}{2} = 0.87L$,

Note here l is approximately represented by $\frac{L}{2}$.


s
d
C


a
b
j
p


30
25
20
15
10
5
0
0
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90


a’
b
j
p


a’’
a
b
j
p